



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,846	09/25/2003	Eugene George Olczak	133074-1	8697

6147 7590 08/25/2005
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
GLOBAL RESEARCH
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

CHEVALIER, ALICIA ANN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,846

Applicant(s)

OLCZAK ET AL

Examiner

Alicia Chevalier

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in the application, claims 14-28 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Amendments to the claims, filed on June 14, 2005, have been entered in the above-identified application.

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

3. The 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections of claim 10, made of record in the office action March 14, 2005, page 2, paragraph #5 have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment in the response filed June 24, 2005.

REJECTIONS

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McGrath (U.S. Patent No. 4,025,159).

Regarding Applicant's claim 1, McGrath discloses a multiplayer optical film (*cellular retroreflective sheeting, title*). The film comprises at least two component films (*bass sheet and cover film, col. 3, lines 25-26*). At least one of the component films (*bass sheet*) has an upper

Art Unit: 1772

and lower surface (*figure 3*). The upper surface comprises a series of optical structures (*microspheres, col. 3, line 33*) and a plurality of raised spacing structures (*narrow intersecting bonds, col. 3, line 26*). The lower surface is essentially planar (*figure 3*). The component films are joined so as to constitute a single structure comprising at least one gap disposed between the component films (*figure 3*).

Furthermore, the gap is deemed to be greater than the coherent length of light used to illuminate the optical film since the reference discloses that same height for the spacing structures as claimed by Applicant. See the discussion below regarding claim 7. Furthermore, Applicant's specification on page 7, paragraph [0020] recites that the gap between surfaces should be greater than the coherent length of the light source, typically no less than a few microns.

Regarding Applicant's claims 2 and 3, McGrath discloses that the optical structures are convex and concave structures (*microspheres, col. 3, line 33 and figure 3*).

Regarding Applicant's claim 4, McGrath discloses that the optical structures are prisms, since the reference discloses cube-corner elements can be interchangeable used with the microspheres (*col. 6, lines 13-20 and figure 7*).

Regarding Applicant's claims 5 and 6, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures comprise at least one post-structure and/or at least one beam structure (*narrow intersection bonds, col. 3, line 26 and figures 1, 3 and 7*).

Regarding Applicant's claim 7, McGrath discloses that the spacing structures have a height relative to the optical structures between about 0.1 and about 20 microns, since the reference shows in figure 3 that the spacing structure, i.e. narrow intersection bonds, have a

Art Unit: 1772

height of half the diameter of the optical structures, i.e. microspheres, and the diameter of the microspheres is between 10 and 200 micrometers (*col. 5, lines 29-30*), which means that the height of the narrow intersection bonds is between 5 to 100 microns.

Regarding Applicant's claim 8, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures comprise at least one post-structure (*narrow intersection bonds, col. 3, line 26 and figures 1, 3 and 7*).

Regarding Applicant's claim 9, McGrath discloses that the component films have a thickness between about 0.006 and about 5 millimeters, since the reference discloses that the base sheet has a thickness of 75 micrometers (*col. 6, lines 60-61*) and the cover film has a thickness between 1 and 5 mils (*col. 5, line 14*), which together have a thickness of 100.4-203 micrometers or 0.1 to 0.2 mm.

Regarding Applicant's claim 10, McGrath discloses that the gap comprises solid matter, fluid matter and combinations thereof, since the reference discloses that air, i.e. a fluid, in the gaps (*col. 3, lines 23-30*).

Regarding Applicant's claims 11 and 12, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures have either equal or unequal heights relative to the optical structures (*figures 3 and 7*).

Regarding Applicant's claim 13, figure 3 in McGrath shows that the raised spacing structures occupy an area, the area is deemed to define a percentage of a total area of the film surface upon which the raised spacing structures are disposed. Furthermore, it can be seen from figure 1 that the percentage is in the range between about 1 and about 50.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments in the response filed June 14, 2005 regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 of record have been considered but are moot since the rejections have been withdrawn.

7. Applicant's arguments in the response filed June 14, 2005 regarding the 35 USC 102 rejection over McGrath of record have been carefully considered but are deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant argues that McGrath does not teach the limitation "wherein said gap is greater than the coherent length of light used to illuminate the optical film."

As discussed above, the gap is deemed to be greater than the coherent length of light used to illuminate the optical film since the reference discloses that same height for the spacing structures as claimed by Applicant. See the discussion below regarding claim 7. Furthermore, Applicant's specification on page 7, paragraph [0020] recites that the gap between surfaces should be greater than the coherent length of the light source, typically no less than a few microns.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 1772

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Chevalier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1490. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alicia Chevalier', with a stylized, cursive script.

Alicia Chevalier

8/19/05